

REMARKS

Claims 15–20 and 24–29 are now pending in the application. Claims 15, 24, and 26–29 have been amended. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended during the interview on December 2, 2008. As noted in the Interview Summary, Applicants discussed with the Examiner differences between motion vectors and graphics drawing commands including various ways to amend the claims to overcome the prior art. One such approach, discussed during the interview, is to provide a neutral prior art reference that discloses inherent language that can be used to further define “drawing command” as understood in the art in order to further distinguish the term from “motion vector.” As previously noted in prior responses, Applicants contend that the term “drawing command” and “motion vector” are not analogous. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants are submitting herewith a prior art reference (see the Information Disclosure Statement submitted herewith) that discloses inherent language that can be used to further define “drawing command.” Applicants reserve the right to file continuation or further applications to pursue the claims without the amendments currently being made.

Claim Objections

Claim 20 is objected to because the Examiner has failed to find support for the last limitation, namely, the phrase “wirelessly sending the graphic drawing commands.” Applicants submit that this limitation is supported at least at p. 14, ll. 6–9, which states that “in addition to ... sending only recompressed images, the system may also send rendering commands between the transmitter 108 (i.e., wireless drawing command transmitting unit) and the receiver 200 to allow some shadow rendering by the receiver 200.” As such, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 15–20 and 24–29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hannah (U.S. Pat. No. 6,771,704).

With regard to claim 24, Hannah fails to show, teach, or suggest, *inter alia*, sending graphics drawing commands wirelessly to be processed remotely, wherein the graphics drawing commands include at least geometric primitive information.

As best understood by Applicants, Hannah discloses a video data stream that is re-encoded using motion vectors from a prior encoding operation. The video data may be enhanced by the system. Information about the enhancement, along with the decoded motion vectors, is sent to encoding circuitry. Information provided to the encoder is tailored to the type of video data received or to the type of enhancement performed, or based on other criteria. Using the previously derived motion vectors, the encoding circuitry performs fewer computations than when calculating motion vectors from scratch.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that motion vectors are analogous to graphics drawing commands. As noted in Applicants previous response, Applicants respectfully disagree that motion vectors are analogous to graphics drawing commands. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 24 to include the limitation “wherein the graphics drawing commands include at least geometric primitive information,” which inherit in the ordinary meaning of graphics drawing commands and is further supported in the prior art reference submitted herewith.

Applicants can find no mention of sending graphics drawing commands wirelessly to be processed remotely, wherein the graphics drawing commands include at least geometric primitive information in the cited portions of Hannah. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 26–30 are allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 24. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 26–30 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16–19 and 25 each ultimately depend on claims 15 and 24, respectively, and are allowable for at least similar reasons. Claim 16–19 and 25 are also believed to be allowable for having novel and nonobvious subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16–19 and 25 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7788.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 20, 2009

By: 
Jimmie K. Tolliver. Reg. No. 62,264

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle St., Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7788
fax: (312) 609-5005